· · ·		
20	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/751,241	COREY ET AL.
Examiner-initiated into their Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Korie H. Chan	3632
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) Korie H. Chan.	(3)	
(2) <u>Donald Corey</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 March 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☑ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli	icant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
none		
Claims discussed:		
1-20		
Prior art documents discussed:		
none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of the interview in the allowance of the application. To the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ	The examiner will provide a writ e record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview
12.		
for Cha	ant/Applicant's Representative S	ignature if consensists)
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	anvappiicants Representative S	ngnature – ir appropriatė)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On March 15 examiner called to required restriction between group I claims 1-15 drawn to the apparatus of holding an electronic device and group II, claims 16-20 drawn to the method of holding electronic device classified in class 29, subclass 700; applicant elected group I, claims 1-15 without traverse. After further examination and search on the merit of the apparatus claims 1-15, the subject matter was found to be allowable with changes proposed by the examiner and accepted by applicant Mr. Corey on March 16, 2005. In the agreed upon examiner's amendment, claims 3 and 11 was cancelled as the limitation was not further limiting. claims 18-20 was cancelled as it was a non-elected invention. Claims 1 and 9 was amended in the form of new claims 21 and 22. All changes was agreed by applicant Donald Corey.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).